increasing and that future resolutions to these hazards may become more complex. Certain species that frequent landfills, such as ring-billed gulls, are increasing in unprecedented numbers. At the same time, the public is becoming more involved in wildlife management issues. The National Environmental Policy Act may require public involvement in the solution of a wildlife-related airport safety problem. The public's involvement may be costly and time consuming, resulting in a trade-off of accepting potential hazards while possible solutions are debated.

The likelihood of bird strikes may be further exacerbated by design changes to modern aircraft, which incorporate larger inlet engines to achieve reduced noise levels. These larger, quieter engines give birds less warning and require them to avoid a larger surface area.

Findings

1. FAA believes that current data is insufficient to permit an accurate and consistent quantification of the risk created by locating landfills within 5 miles of an airport. Although a quantified risk assessment is not available, the potential hazard of bird strikes has been established in reports following aircraft accidents.

2. FAA believes that landfills constitute a potential hazard to aviation if located within 5 miles from a runway end for the following reasons:

a. Bird strikes in the vicinity of waste disposal activities located within 5 miles of an airport have been a factor in numerous accidents, some involving loss of human life.

b. Bird activity is generally recognized to occur at altitudes that brings it into the path of aircraft during approach and departure operations, the most critical time for aircraft performance.

c. Modern aircraft, with quieter engines and larger engine inlets, increase the potential for bird strikes due to the reduced warning resulting from quieter engines with greater frontal areas which combine to increase the chances of birds being struck or ingested.

d. Bird mitigation techniques, although offered as a solution, have not been proven effective over extended periods of time. In addition, future mitigation programs will become more complicated and require more time to implement, resulting in a trade-off of potential hazards.

e. Landfills are intense attractants to birds. When located in or adjacent to airspace used by aircraft, a potential hazard will result.

3. As total bird control is not possible, the best solution is to restrict actions on or in the vicinity of an active airport to reduce bird attractions.

4. The distance criteria contained in FAA Order 52.005A serve as a reasonable basis for determining the incompatibility of a landfill site with airport operations.

Recommendations

Although not a solution to all airport-related bird hazards, locating intense attractions to wildlife, such as landfills, outside the areas specified by the FAA reduces the risk of a potentially hazardous collision between aircraft and birds. Progress has been made toward this goal by the EPA. Although EPA stops short of prohibiting landfills within the 5,000 and 10,000 foot areas designated by the FAA, it does require that operators of existing municipal solid waste landfills within those areas demonstrate to the State agency that issues municipal solid waste permits that such units do not pose a bird hazard to aircraft. Additionally, proponents of new or expanded landfill sites within 5 miles of an airport must notify the affected airport and the FAA of their intentions.

In an effort to enhance aviation safety. FAA recommends that no new or expanded municipal solid waste or putrescible landfill be located within the FAA specified 5,000 and 10,000 foot criteria or in the approach/departure areas within 5 miles of an airport if deemed incompatible with safe aircraft operations.

[FR Doc. 95–12899 Filed 5–24–95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Research and Development Programs Meeting

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces a public meeting at which NHTSA will describe and discuss specific research and development projects and request suggestions for agenda topics.

DATES AND TIMES: The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration will hold a public meeting devoted primarily to presentations of specific research and development projects on June 27, 1995, beginning at 1:30 p.m. and ending at approximately 5:00 p.m. The deadline for interested parties to suggest agenda topics is 4:15 p.m. on June 8, 1995. Questions may be submitted in advance regarding the agency's research and development projects. They must be submitted in writing by June 19, 1995, to the address given below. If sufficient time is available, questions received after the June 19 date will be answered at the meeting in the discussion period. The individual, group, or company asking a question does not have to be present for the question to be answered. A consolidated list of the questions submitted by June 19 will be available at the meeting and will be mailed to requesters after the meeting.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Ramada Inn, near Detroit Metro Airport, 8270 Wickham Rd., Romulus, MI 48174. Suggestions for specific R&D topics as described below and questions for the June 27, 1995, meeting relating to the agency's research and development programs should be submitted to the Office of the Associate Administrator for Research and Development, NRD–01, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Room 6206, 400 Seventh St., SW, Washington, DC 20590. The fax number is 202–366–5930.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: NHTSA intends to provide detailed presentations about its research and development programs in a series of quarterly public meetings. The series started in April 1993. The purpose is to make available more complete and timely information regarding the agency's research and development programs. This tenth meeting in the series will be held on June 27, 1995.

NHTSA requests suggestions from interested parties on the specific agenda topics. NHTSA will base its decisions about the agenda, in part, on the suggestions it receives by close of business at 4:15 p.m. on June 8, 1995. Before the meeting, it will publish a notice with an agenda listing the research and development topics to be discussed. NHTSA asks that the suggestions be taken from the list below and that they be limited to six, in priority order, so that the presentations at the June 27 R&D meeting can be most useful to the audience. Please note that almost all of these topics have been discussed at the previous nine meetings to some extent and that presentations at the tenth meeting will be reports on current status, results, and plans.

Specific Crashworthiness R&D topics are:

Improved frontal crash protection problem analysis and program status,
Advanced glazing research,
Highway traffic injury studies,
Head and neck injury research,

Lower extremity injury research,
Thorax injury research,
Human injury simulation and analysis,
Crash test dummy component development,
Vehicle aggressivity and fleet compatibility,
Upgrade side crash protection,
Upgrade seat and occupant restraint systems,
Child safety research, and
Electric and alternate fuel vehicle safety.

Specific Crash Avoidance R&D topics are:

Truck crashworthiness/occupant protection,
Truck tire traction,
Portable data acquisition system for crash avoidance research,
Systems to enhance EMS response (automatic collision notification)
Vehicle motion environment,
Crash causal analysis,
Human factors guidelines for crash avoidance warning devices,
Longer combination vehicle safety,
Drowsy driver monitoring
Driver workload assessment, and
Performance guidelines for IVHS systems (approach).

Questions regarding research projects that have been submitted in writing not later than close of business on June 19, 1995, will be answered as time permits. Beginning with this tenth meeting, the time allotted to answering questions has been increased. A transcript of the meeting, copies of materials handed out at the meeting, and copies of the suggestions offered by commenters will be available for public inspection in the NHTSA's Technical Reference Section, Room 5108, 400 Seventh St., SW, Washington, DC 20590. Copies of the transcript will then be available at 10 cents a page, upon request to NHTSA's Technical Reference Section. The Technical Reference Section is open to the public from 9:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

NHTSA will provide technical aids to participants as necessary, during the Research and Development Programs Meeting. Thus, any person desiring the assistance of ''auxiliary aids'' (e.g., sign-language interpreter, telecommunication devices for deaf persons (TTDs), readers, taped texts, braille materials, or large print materials and/or a magnifying device), please contact Rita Gibbons on 202–366–4862 by close of business June 21, 1995.

FOR FUTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rita Gibbons, Administrative Staff Assistant, Office of research and Development, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590. Telephone 202–366–4862. Fax number: 202–366–5930.

Issued: May 19, 1995.

George L. Parker,

Associate Administrator for Research and Development.

[FR Doc. 95–12832 Filed 5–24–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–M

Research and Special Programs Administration

[Docket No. P–94–1W; Notice 2]

Columbia Gulf Transmission Company; Transportation of Natural Gas by Pipeline, Grant of Waiver

Columbia Gulf Transmission Company (Columbia Gulf) has petitioned the Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA) for a waiver from compliance with 49 CFR 192.612(b)(3), which requires that gas pipeline facilities in the Gulf of Mexico found to be exposed on the seabed or constituting a hazard to navigation be reburied so that the top of the pipe is 36 inches below the seabed for normal excavation or 18 inches for rock excavation.

During a DOT-required survey, Columbia Gulf discovered that a 260 foot portion of the 36-inch Bluewater Mainline 200 did not meet the 12-inch depth of cover requirements of § 192.612. At the point where coverage is not sufficient, Columbia Gulf's pipeline crosses over a Trunkline Gas Company (Trunkline) 16-inch pipeline and an Amoco Production Company (AMOCO) abandoned 4-inch pipeline. Therefore, Columbia Gulf cannot comply with the lowering requirement without first lowering or crossing below the Trunkline and Amoco pipelines. This coincidental lowering would present the potential for damage to these lines which could cause environmental pollution.

This waiver will allow Columbia Gulf to cover 813 feet along the subject pipeline segment with a concrete mesh blanket alternative to the 36-inch depth of cover requirement. The waiver will also extend the time limitation required for compliance with § 192.612 until November 30, 1995, to allow for completion of the work.

A ''concrete mesh blanket'' unit is an 8 foot x 20 foot section constructed from 160 individually cast 17 inch x 17 inch x 9 inch beveled concrete briquettes inter-connected with ¾ inch polypropelene UV stabilized line. A total of 41 (8 foot x 20 foot x 9 inch) units of ''concrete mesh blanket'' will be required to cover the 813 feet of affected pipeline. Each of the 41 units will be hydrojetted flush with the seabed and permanently anchored with six screw anchors.

The top of the 12-inch pipeline the mesh blanket is intended to cover is presently buried 6 inches below unconsolidated bottom in the Gulf of Mexico from Lat. 29°30′21.46″, Long. 92°22′54.08″ to Lat. 29°30′13.4″, Long. 92°22′53.98″; Block 15, Vermillion area, approximately 8 miles South of Pecan Island, LA. The pipeline is coated with concrete.

The use of the proposed blanket will effectively cover the pipeline to 15 inches (9″ blanket + 6″ cover). The required reburial is to 36 inches below the bottom or 18 inches below a rock bottom. Therefore this waiver is necessary to allow for the use of the concrete mesh blanket.

Columbia Gulf will also install a rock shield over the pipeline before installation of the blanket. The rock shield must be of at least ⅜ inches of thickness constructed of an appropriate material, such as ''Tuff N Nuff'' manufactured by Submar.

In response to this petition and the justification contained therein, RSPA issued a notice of petition for waiver inviting interested parties to comment (Notice 1)(60 FR 10893, Feb. 28, 1995). In that notice, RSPA explained why granting a waiver from the requirements of § 192.612 to allow placement of the concrete mesh blanket would not have a deleterious impact on safety. Comments were received from three pipeline operators and one interstate pipeline association. Each commentor endorsed the petition and recommended granting the waiver.

One commentor further recommended that RSPA also require Columbia Gulf to notify Trunkline at least 48 hours in advance so as to allow a Trunkline inspector to be present while work is in progress in the vicinity of its pipeline. RSPA agrees, and hereby requires Columbia Gulf to notify Trunkline as described.

In view of these reasons and those stated in the foregoing discussion, RSPA, by this order, finds that a waiver of compliance with § 192.612(c)(3) is consistent with pipeline safety. Accordingly, Columbia Gulf Transmission Company's petition from compliance with § 192.612(b)(3) is granted.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 1672(d); § 1.53, and appendix A of part 106.